

Bottcher, Helen

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 12:34 PM
To: wyckoffcomments; (b) (6)
Subject: Comments on Wyckoff Proposed Plan

Dear Ms. Bottcher:

We collectively own and live in two properties near the Wyckoff Superfund Site (b) (6)
(b) (6).

We have reviewed the Proposed Plan and associated Focused Feasibility studies for the Wyckoff/Eagle Harbor Superfund Site.

Our main concern is EPA's selection of a cleanup alternative that greatly elongates the cleanup schedule and delays the creation of public space. The selected alternative appears to implement the remedy in two phases, with a concomitant increase in duration until remedial completion. However, Alternative 4 in the Focused Feasibility study has a much shorter implementation phase, and relies on a more extensive use of in-site stabilization and solidification (ISS, the same technology applied in the preferred alternative).

Importantly, the costs appear similar (\$88.6 million for Alternative 4 and \$82.4 million for the selected alternative, according to the April 2016 Focused Feasibility study (OU2/OU4).

Most relevant to the Bainbridge community and our neighborhoods in particular is the much shorter duration to potential redevelopment of the space as a public park. Alternative 4 appears to have a 10 year remedy implementation phase, whereas the selected alternative will require 23 years of remedy implementation. Furthermore, the selected alternative requires another sheet pile wall to be driven outside the existing sheet pile wall, which is extremely noisy to residents in the vicinity.

Given the similar costs, but drastically lower time to remedy completion, and the reliance on similar technology (ISS), this does not make sense. Why should the community suffer through an elongated construction project, on the off-hand chance that Phase 2 of the remedy is not necessary or can be scaled back? The difference between potentially having a public space for community space after 10 years, versus 23 years, is enormous – and for some of us, means we may never have an opportunity to enjoy the space.

We strongly encourage EPA to reconsider and select Alternative 4.

Sincerely yours,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)